M 2108

Saturday, March 11, 1972

Lunch and Music

SATURDAY LUNCH

MR. WYLAND: Silence forces me to creep out of my hole like a groundhog. And then when I am out, then of course I have to say something before I can go back. I sit in that little office downstairs and I think: Now I have to go upstairs, I have to eat a little bit, I have to be amiable, I have to say this and that and so forth. And what will be good to say to everybody? And of course I get stuck because I cannot know everybody and I can generalize and say certain things that concern me and I think are important, but it doesn't mean that they have that importance for you.

At the same time I think - if you are alive, alive to the fact that you are here for a definite purpose - you can always take certain things with you and perhaps digest them, eat them, to become or let that what is an idea become part of you. How long you will hold on to it and how long that will last, the digestive process also - you know food reaches the stomach, within one hour it is in the intestines, and then you might say

that what has to be extracted because of the condition of the stomach is different again from a little later. But the time is past of digesting it. When we talk, when there is something that we want to discuss, there is a certain period of wanting to take it in. After a meeting, for instance, it does not last so long anymore before the impression of the meeting is gone. The next day you may remember a few things. A couple of days later it is vague. It happens to be the way we are constituted. It's unfortunate, but of course when one lives superficially there is much more possibility of losing yourself.

If you see superficial--superficiality as the surface of a globe, the more you go towards the center the less chance there is for getting lost, because the circumference, which is more and more concentric as circles within a globe reaching the central point, naturally the circumference becomes less and less. So it becomes more concentrated for you in regard to your inner life. The deeper you can go - that is, away from the surface - allowing essential qualities to remain in you, the more chance there is for such qualities to stay.

We talk about Work. We talk about maintenance of Work in yourself; maintenance of a desire for the continuation of your inner life, spiritually, on the basis of - we call it less dense - of that what is for you lighter, which would enable you after some time to become lighter yourself, lifting you up away from the Earth, preparing, as it way to go to Heaven. How you can walk, maybe, sometimes, and remembering that; how the different thoughts which affect you can be changed in different direction, taking the energy from such thoughts and pointing them in the right direction upward. What can you do in your ordinary life, when you are just busy, that is, with ordinary things? What can you do when you are busy in activities, also

ordinary things? What is it that makes you realize that the activities have an influence on Work as a whole in this Barn for different people who come Saturday and Sunday to wish to work, maybe on themselves? How much do you understand of it? How much is your obligation to show it to others?

February, as I said before, was a concentrated month. This year is a practical application of Work in daily life. March should be devoted to seeing what is wrong, and particularly what is wrong with activities. What is it that you don't do that you should do if you consider, when you are engaged in an activity which you want to make as perfect as you can and for which you should have ambition, what is it that you feel that ought to be done? I would like you to spend March in consideration of what can be done to improve different ways of your Work in your activity. By that I mean Chardavoyne Barn Activities of course in the first place, because we are dependent on that to a great extent to maintain this kind of life. I've said before that whatever money comes from that is used for the maintenance. I've always--also told you it is not enough as yet to maintain it, so money has to come from different sources in order to continue; and of course we will continue, at the same time hoping that that what we can accomplish - and what we should, without any trouble, really - is dependent entirely on your attitude in wanting to make it much more perfect - and maybe not perfect, reasonably correct, maybe. How will you do it? And this applies, I say, to activities as we know about from the standpoint of the Barn, but it applies of course to your ordinary life and the way you want to live.

Spring is now getting nearer and nearer. Expenses, I hope, will be a little less. What can you do to improve your state, your level of being,

the way you live? The relationships you have established - what can you do to improve them? Where can you find reasons why sometimes relationships are not maintained? Where is selfishness on the part of yourself? Where is attention that you should pay to certain things and you don't do it? Where is your prejudice or your conceit?

If you do something, do it right and well, otherwise don't do it. If you want to spend money, spend it when you have it. Don't write checks against an empty bank account. Try to understand that you--in time you would have to pay anyhow. The balance of your accounts payable and the accounts receivable certainly should match. And the receivables should be more in order to give you a profit. It is so simple, but of course you don't live in accordance with it because you hope for the best. And you expect that something that will happen tomorrow and is not happening today, you rationalize about why it doesn't happen today. And then assuming that that what happens today will not happen tomorrow - in all probability it will happen and you will not get the money that you expect. And you have to shovel around a little bit and borrow here and there.

This is what I mean as a task for the rest of this month: Can you put your own house in order? Can you, at the end of the month, if you make that as a deadline, come to a conclusion that you are above water, that you have paid your debts to the extent that you are able? Or make a clear slate or an arrangement in which you acknowledge what you owe and that perhaps you will say: I want to promise to pay when - at a certain time - and hold yourself to it. When you live in a house and you--it is not clean, can you make up your mind that you want to clean it, that you want to live that way, that there is a responsibility on you? When you don't ta--pay attention to your car because you are a little bit careless,

can you change your mind and take care? Can you follow up on the obligations you already have? Don't add any more but settle them first.

We talk during this year about ordinary life, this time influenced by your wish to Work on yourself and then beginning with your ordinary life to make it a foundation on one--on which this spiritual building can be--can rest. The task is still right here on this Earth for human beings who claim to be interested in the ideas of Gurdjieff. And don't prattle too much about the ideas when you yourself fail in your ordinary life on this Earth, in your home, in relationships with people, in whatever your thoughts are and expenditures of your time for thoughts and feelings in your activities. All of that, you let pass by in review. You sit somewhere on a stone and there they come, one after the other. It's all you passing by in different kind of costume, in different kind of postures and attitudes, with different thoughts and feelings in your mind. It is a whole parade, St. Patrick's Day, to see what can come in front of you as a parade of yourself, and become acquainted with yourself as you walk and come by and are scrutinized by something that is you also, sitting on that stone. And maybe you cry a little bit when you see yourself coming down the road and again disappearing, in the way you have behaved and you remember. Maybe sometimes during certain days of this month, you take a film and you unroll it at the end; and you try to be honest about your behavior, about what you have promised and didn't keep, why it was this way and that - and without too much rationalising, excusing yourself.

Face the truth in ordinary life first. Admit that we make many mistakes and that we are willing to try to correct it and to see then what you can do because then your attitude becomes a positive one, it is not laissez-faire, it is something that I say: It comes to me, I must

meet it. I meet it, when the parade comes there and different personages indicating different manifestations of yourself. You see, when it comes and you sit, you get up once in a while; you shake hands with that kind of a fellow who comes in front of you. You recognize him. It's you. And he says, "Yes," and it is you. And you agree, you shake hands: That is me. And then that other fellow can go on because he is satisfied that he has been recognized, that there was no exchange of excuses between the two of you. You can go back again and sit on the stone and wait for another one that you remember and again you might have to get up and say, "I do recognize you for what you are. It is me that walks there. It's not a dream. It is, really, I remember very well that is the way I actually am. Thank God I sit at a place where I can see it." And perhaps I call it an objective rock on which I sit. And I let my subjectivity pass by on the road so that I can see it, in sunlight, in clarity of the day, not hiding, not in darkness, not even with a little flashlight. In full view I want to have the truth. Sometimes you must do that during this month. You must see your behavior and you must have the courage to acknowledge it.

I have asked you for little statements in a cassette about your activities. It's good I get them. It's good for you. It's much and much better for you than for me. It is for you that I ask you.

We have meetings Thursday. What is there still wrong in your opinion? What can we do to improve them? What is it that you feel we ought to do? Tell me. Maybe we can do it. Can you derive enough for yourself? Is a meeting like Thursday of value? Should we change it? Should I stop? Should I do something else? Monday: perhaps you know also a little bit about it. It's not in Warwick, so of course not so

many people will come to Monday. On the Wednesday: tape listening, it belongs to it.

What are we doing to try to keep Work on a level? What can we do to help sustain it, to prop it up, to look at Work, to see us as representations of Work in our daily life? Today, this afternoon, tomorrow - all during the week to be reminded: What are we trying to do? How are we going to walk on the road which ends in death of this physical body? Many, many years I hope there are ahead of you, but many years you still have to spend because the road is not easy. We can say it is worthwhile. You can verify that, you can believe in it. You can be discouraged at times. Maybe after some time you come back again because you know how empty is the rest of the world. What do we get fed by but a lot of political phraseology of stupid people who don't really know anything at all but still they have to talk because that happens to be their business. What is there for them as inner life? What is there for us if we believe that inner life will give the balance for oneself; that we must, really we are compelled to Work?

When that starts to sink in, that you are under an obligation to Work, that you must know if you don't Work you are just ordinary for this Earth - and without calling it what Gurdjieff calls us - for yourself you have to know what kind of measure you ought to apply to yourself; to the beginnings of your Soul when it comes and looks and doesn't feel at home and it disappears; to a group when people come in and expect great expectations and they come and they don't come back. What is it that we fail in? What is it we should do? To what extent can we and are we willing? How much really do you want to put on the right side of the scale? What is it that you wish and could you sacrifice? What is it of yourself that

you can get rid of? Your self-centeredness, your being closed within yourself, not allowing life of other people to exist, sometimes even pushing them away, stepping on them, squashing them, not assisting in their life. But when will you pray to yourself to find out what it is that is in the way and to ask God to forgive you, but at the same time requesting, definitely demanding His help. You say, "I am here, I know; tell me I must do this and that. I will do it. By God, I will do it." Sometimes that is necessary to come to that kind of a conclusion.

Make it a good afternoon to the extent of your ability. Don't overshoot the mark. But don't be below it, either. Hit it straight. As I say, in March, dot the I's and cross the T. Dot your 'I'. Make it complete. Create it in the image of a completeness, Objectivity and all, ability to give you facts, discriminating between that what is impartial and partiality, and allowing gradually the concept of infinity to penetrate into the concepts of your li--your 'I', so that you in time could become timeless. Try to remember. Don't be superficial all the time.

To a good afternoon, I hope. Make it as good as you can.

And so, Victor, we play a little, all right?

MUSIC

MR. HYLAND: So. For next Monday: It will be the last time that I will be in New York, at least for a little while. I think it has been sufficient. We will continue a little longer with Thursday, and also there I think we will make a change again after some time. The reason for Monday is simply that I have taken over that group for a little while and I want

to give it back again to the nucleus, because if I don't do that I deprive the nucleus of an opportunity.

And the aim of course is always that one starts to learn how to talk about Work and to explain it for one's own benefit, not only for those who might listen to it. The need for having to formulate makes it clearer for oneself. And so it is completely in line with what we would like to call a development of a man in order to talk then about Work on himself that he will profit by it and increases his own capacity for Work. The attempt that he has to make is, as I explained last time, I think, to formulate in a clear manner so that there is no further maybe about it - that one can still discuss it and perhaps even argue a little. But the principle should be understood because, after all, what is what we try? What is it that we are trying to do? To find out why man is on Earth. That is really the problem; or that is the question for oneself. Why are we here? In a very much smaller way, why are we here tonight? To talk about us, about our life, our aims, our reasoning, our wish to find out, if we can, why we are doing what we are doing. And the question always is, then, what is it that we are doing, and for what?

If we find ourselves alive on this Earth, it must of course have a connection with being on Earth, because we are not somewhere else, and what is the meaning maybe of being here on this Earth if there are other places where perhaps we could be or where there might be other forms of life - maybe not necessarily in the same form as we have, as what we call a human being, because we're not restricted even to that on the Earth itself. We have different forms of life on the Earth. And when we consider what we are and compare it then with different other kinds of forms of life, we ask exactly the same question: Why do animals exist? And why

do plants exist? And what is there as a reason for the existence of ordinary inorganic matter or crystals or substances of that kind, ordinary matter without apparently any life, at least life that we cannot see or don't distinguish or that we are not familiar with. Is this, in particular, reason to assume that man, as he is living on Earth and has a thinking capacity, that that is the highest form of life on Earth?

Is Earth limiting our life? And in order to make a little order out of the different ways we see life existing and we simply assume that what we call plants and that kind of a kingdom, organic as a one-cell entities, and animals with two cells or two centers, and a man with three centers. I said cell because that was originally how it started, as a cell not growing up any further than one center. But there must be a certain time, if an animal starts out with one cell, that it is split up and becomes two different kind of functions in an animal. And so it would be with a man. So that when he is born or conceived there is the potentiality of a man to develop three centers. And does that have a particular meaning? Because we apparently stop at three. Do we know anything about a four-centered entity? Are we limited to three? Because this is usually, if one wants to discover something about life or about oneself or the Earth, that we try to find laws, regulations, which can be understood and then, in understanding them, we can base on it certain theories which we can believe in. And then when a theory is acted out as a law and we assume then that there are no contradictory experiences, that then the law gradually becomes much more truthful. And as I often said, when it is a working hypothesis it is for the purposes of being able to work with it. Or that what really would become the truth, we call axiomatic. Axio--axiomatic means really that there is no further question about it in any way whatso-

ever, and you might say that that is the end of it.

So, similarly, are three centers the end of the forms of life on Earth? It's not that we cannot conceive of something else as being four-centered. That could be quite possible. But we want to reduce that kind of thought to the simplest form. And although every once in a while we say that the physical center is really divided into two different parts, one instinctive and the other physical as such - that of course we can make more centers by dividing them - but the principle remains really that there are through--three definite functions in a man; even if they do overlap they have a very definite reason for existence. Is that the end then? What is this three?

When we take dimensions there are three. We cannot go further. We talk about four dimensions or a four-dimensional world. But that has to do with the three-dimensional entity moving; and by introduction of a moving instead of a static condition, we then assume that that is another dimension. It is not in reality dimension in space, although we travel in space. It becomes a dimension in time. And then the fourth dimension of space would be really the first dimension of time itself.

Do we need more than one dimension in time? Of course we do. One is a question of distance, extending. One is a question of movement against the line of existence. The third is again another movement of that what is a plane in space. In time, it means that what is me as existing in my life. The second is the existence of all life at the same time. The third is the totality of a historical value of all life. If applied to man, it simply means mankind on Earth, totally considered in history from its beginning to its end, would be the third dimension of time for a man. And then again it stops. A sphere ends in a three-dimensional world. And in order to continue with the wish to see if that

kind of an entity can be more useful than just ending up at the three dimension, we have to reduce it again to a point.

In an octave, the three points that are important are the DO and the FA and the SI-DO. That forms the triangle, as it were. In the octave itself we have DO-RE-MI; then we have a change-over with FA, which is one and a half; but then again we have another triad, SOL-LA-SI; then again a DO, that's the end of the octave. How do we go from one octave to another? By the reducing of an octave to a point which then becomes the next DO and has the possibility of growing out again into a new octave.

(What's) the question of light? Three primary colors; also, dividing light, white--white light, into its component parts, we get an octave of a spectrum. But again the combination of all such colors produce white or the three fundamental colors produce it. Again we are stuck on three; and it is like that in what we call nature and we cannot get away from it. But we don't always see it. And then we call it different as a law of noumena because we cannot see it. We do know of its existence, however; and that what we can see as a phenomenon, we make up of seven. And the combination of the seven and the three in the octave is made up of two triads connected with a seventh; that is, two triads each consisting of three.

The limitations for man is a three-dimensional world. The realisation of that, and keeping on thinking about that - what is really that makes a man wish for something else? He knows what is past. He knows what may be future. He knows there is a changing point from future into past, which is the present, and that's his sense of time. Again he is bound by the three, what we call three-foldness or three-unity. And in order to progress, it has to become one, two and three becoming one; that one becoming another one in the sense of connecting with that what is next in progress

and then forming another three. When we look at the man as he is and he wants to think about his future, he has to stand on what he has been. He thinks at the present time his future is in the dark.

What is the aim of a man, to really grow up? First to understand his past and to become free from it so that in the present, in which he lives each time when he speaks, he can consider what could be his future. If there is a Law of Three, a man is bound by that law. And this is the greatest difficulty, for a man to understand that he is bound by the Earth and nature as it is and that his sole desire for wishing to grow is inherent in him in the realisation of his bondage. And he wants to get free from the Law of Three in order to become one in the next possibility of his existence. So that the purpose of man as he is alive on Earth is dependent on the understanding of his Law of Three and trying to make out of that law a oneness by which he could become free from the Law of Three on the Earth.

If we talk about Heaven, we mean that in order to go from the Earth to Heaven one has to have a certain point from where that what is now can be released, as it were, and that in the process of that releasing certain other things take place which enable a man to go up to the next - I call it - triad, because as long as we keep on thinking about that what might happen in the future, we are still bound by the particular ideas which belong to us as we are now.

What is it that prevents a man when he wishes to grow into the future? What is hanging onto him when, at the present, he seems to live now? And although the future is like a stream of time flowing through him, and at each time when it reaches him disappears into the past so that the past constantly is augmented and the future is reduced, it simply means that man moves in his lifetime from one point to another, and at any one point

on that line he can keep on thinking about what is the meaning of his life. So if he considers the past and wants to build on the past, as it were, what might be the future and uses a certain way of extrapolation, he is dependent on what he has gone through and that his mind and his feelings are completely tinted by that what he has experienced. If that is a law - and undoubtedly it must be a law for anyone who lives on the Earth, because he cannot get away from that - he must be very careful, when he wants to project himself into the future, that he is not taking along all the different attributes of his past.

What is the difficulty for a man when he wants to grow up? By which I mean now that he wants to destroy the three-unity of his dimensions on Earth and wants to go away from the Earth; that means away from the Law of Three as he knows it on this Earth and wants to go, as I say sometimes, up; that is, away from Earth means more freedom. And if his--in his conception that what is Heaven or what for him might even be eternity, the first step would be a vertical line away from that what is the plane of his living now in which his three-dimensional world seems to take place. Although it is not entirely true, because if a man has a superficial way of living, there is also a deeper dimension to him. And there is an ultimate depth of his dimension in the central point of his own existence. And we distinguish for a man, in superficiality or surface into essentiality, and that what is essentially essence as a point. That what is the depth of a man is where that particular direction, as it were, stops when he goes from the surface to his inner life. And that then the realization for the dimensionality of a man again is his super--his superficial way of living, his essential way of considering and that what he is in reality.

When he understands those three, and there is something that, as it were, could become a master of the three - because only then will it be

possible that the three could be combined into one - it is still a question: Can the three, when they have been full-grown, unite on their own accord? That is always a very difficult question because maybe it is necessary to assume that something else of a higher character interferes or affects a condition which for--let's say for the Earth would be perfect but will not allow such perfection to exist; and because of that the fusion of three centers, or the fusion of three bodies, as we explain it sometimes, is an essential characteristic of the death of man as a whole before he could enter into a new realm which of course we call Cosmic Consciousness.

And so the question of a man developing: When he sees that he is bound by the three-dimensional world of himself, and that automatically his future would come without he himself doing anything about it simply because he has a life force which continues to live on this Earth as long as his machinery is sufficient to take care of it - then he is faced with the question, how can he free himself from this Earth in order to reach Heaven? I say Heaven; that means the freedom for a man which his aim should be. And perhaps we don't agree on that because his aim, should it be freedom? Or should it be perfection? We'll talk some more about that.

(All right.) (Turning of cassette)

We can assume that when a man is born on Earth that there is a reason for his birth, a reason for his existence here, and that he cannot leave until that reason has been understood or has come to a logical conclusion. And that it is, to some extent, even preposterous for a man to think about wishing to leave this Earth, although he is perfectly willing to pay for his existence on the Earth, but he wants to get through with it as fast as he can. The idea of Work on oneself is preposterous. It is when man wants to interfere with a certain law which exists on the Earth and what right he

has even to consider it - or when he knows what to do, even to do it. It is a particular property of a certain kind of a person who is not satisfied with his life as it is being lived, and where he, in his existence and what we call unconsciously, has to perform the different regulations, or live in accordance with the different regulations of this Earth. And when he dares to talk about wishing to be free from it, he has to have a very definite reason to counteract the laws of Mother Nature or of the Earth.

This is the interesting question for a man and it is the interesting question for any three-centered being. It doesn't matter what form of life it would take. It does not take place in a two-centered one and it is not in a one-centered. Although they represent life, they are not perfected as far as the expression is concerned. And the manifestation of life, when it has not reached the three possibility of a center, is not as yet up to the point where it can even consider the possibility of further growing away from it. So in one way the function of a man, by virtue of being three-centered, implies for him that it may be possible to get away from the three-centered existence. And looking at it that way, it is not so preposterous because that what really started a man in his own triad of the three centers is that what he was born with; and this life force, as being then expressed or perhaps taking on a form, is not really familiar to the form itself, than only the form existing on the place where it happens to be manifested; and that in reality life is not bound to this Earth. And his many thoughts about the possibility of life existing at different places and of course in the assumption, which is quite logical, that he calls life eternal, immediately means that when li--man becomes aware of his life, he becomes aware of the potentialities of freedom for his life. And that from then on, the purpose for a man is to see how to

reach that freedom. And of course it is logical that when he thinks about that, the first thought that would come to his mind is: I want to be free from the manifestation which I perceive and which I know now exists and which binds me, which is my body. And it is almost as if there is an indication in nature of that kind because man, as he is on this Earth, always dies with his body, and there is no exception to that law. And understanding that law as an absolute necessity, it also means that there is a hope given to a man while he becomes aware of the existence of his life within his body, that his body is not of that importance in relation to life itself and, for that reason, that he has to find ways and means to free his life from his body.

It doesn't matter very much if, after he dies physically, that life again has to have a different kind of a form in order to continue to be manifested. But for that also, one simply starts assuming that he will have to go through different realms of life existing in different forms; and gradually, again after settling for the Law of Three, that then life actually could be freed. And we're quite inventive about giving words to such concepts. And we say then that the potentialities for a man on Earth is that he could become self-conscious, which means a tried form of consciousness in which the three centers have developed into three full-grown bodies, and that the next tried for a man is what we call Cosmic Consciousness in which a man again has to go through three phases of further development in order to loosen himself from his name.

It is a spiritual world for us from the standpoint where we are and the existence of that, belonging to a different kind of a realm - and which we call cosmic - simply starts to take in that what is on the other side or rather outside of our own solar system, and extends as far as we can see, which is the Milky Way. But then there is still a third which is of an

entirely different nature. It is the universal existence of life in which gradually that what is now life coming from a man, leaving his name, becomes gradually fused with the totality of all life existing. And then the concept of that form of eternity, if it is a form, is reduced to three different dimensions which we call omnipresence and omniscience and omnipotence - again three. And it is in that unity that God becomes represented as infinity or absoluteness.

Now such is the aim of a man to try to understand the preposterousness of his own desire for freedom. And this gives a certain indication that if he leaves it to Mother Nature that ultimately a man will be freed in so-called time or in different reincarnations of time or in different levels of being; and not wanting to do anything about it himself, he will be taken up by the current which exists around him in the form of Mother Nature, also being subject to the same law of evolution; that gradually that what then takes place must take place to all man living on the Earth and the totality of mankind. And it begin--again becomes a little preposterous to consider the possibility of speeding up that process, because many times man is in a hurry and it is only because he will die and he does not understand that his life could exist and continue. If he were satisfied that he actually could experience that fact that his life will continue and it has nothing to do with the form of his body, man already at that time would be free. But he isn't; and because of that I say he is in a hurry, so he's looking for a catalyzer. He's looking for an insight that gives him the chance to speed up the progress of his development. And in that way he wants to get away from what is taking place on the Earth and reach Heaven a little quicker because he says he has no time to lose.

And then the question comes up: What is in his way? Where is he bound and to what extent? And is he willing to let his bondage go? And

if he is willing to do that, what will take his place--its place? And will man feel at home when he has less bondage? And that is a very serious question because, you see, if it's simply a matter of freedom from the body, he would kill himself and, at the same time, he would not fulfill the other requirements. He has nothing to continue with and he has no assurance that his life will be on a higher level. And against that even, he would know that most likely he has not fulfilled his function on Earth. And maybe he says there is another law that will compel me to come back and work out my own Karma - again and again; no one knows in what form that kind of life would have to return to the Earth and how it would have to be born again. And it may be quite possible that although it is life, such a man dying prematurely by means of himself and not asking God and not asking for forgiveness may have to start as a plant; and going through the cycle of one center and developing another center to reach the second, two-centered, and maybe two-centered to become three, very much the same as when a note DO is struck, it will create RE, it will create MI, dependent on the intensity of the tonality. But again at MI of course it will stop and return, like MI-RE-DO, back to its origin.

These cycles of going up and returning, that what we on Earth call the negative and the positive quality, only seeing that there is one force and an opposing one like Hell and Heaven - and never considering Purgatory than only when one is so-called free from this Earth and imagining then that Purgatory exists as a certain place for purification after death. And of course it is not true - it exists now. We are between Heaven and Hell; we are now in Purgatory. And now is the chance to try to understand how to become free by the purification. I say what is the difficulty for a man to understand it, to see how free he could become, it depends on his past. He keeps his past with him for a very long time because he is afraid

that if he loses it, and not knowing the future and not knowing what it will bring, he will not dare to settle and burn his bridges behind him and hope for the best. And that is true even in ordinary life and one is very careful to be able to live and not to be too spontaneous and measure it out a little and consider it and even at times sit and think for a long time and even start to meditate about it. But how much more it is for a man when he wants to go to different kind of regions away from the Earth, and what we mean by evolution. How much less does he even know where he will go to and what is then a possibility for him that he can have no fear, than only when during the time that he wishes to prepare for possible freedom that he makes something that will be able to contain his life in a certain form, still adhering to his own life, but freeing himself from the manifestations of his body.

I say, what are the different factors that make a person hesitant? Why doesn't he want to give up? It is his education; his youth; the way he has been formed, although originally, as a child - and having freedom at that time and not being inhibited and actually much more conscious than we are; the constant covering up by means of so-called culture or education; or indication from family, or that what many times has become quite dogmatic, living in a certain framework of an existence as created by one's family with all the best of intentions, nevertheless leaving a very definite mark on a person who is impressionable; and then forming, particularly on the Earth, certain systems even including doctrines of living of that what has to be followed, or the dire necessity if it is not followed, that one would go to hell or that something like the devil would come and eat you up - and all the different nonsense. But not nonsense for a person who is impressionable. It is very much the truth which is then being told in accordance with whatever that requirement may be, and not knowing any

distinction, one takes it; and that we call the conditioning of a man as he happens to grow up - until he comes to a certain point in his life when he starts to consider all that what has been given to him and he says what--in what way should I now be bound by that what is not my own and what came from somewhere else, although I have taken it in, not knowing any better? He comes to certain years of distinction of making differences between that what is his own and what isn't. And then he looks around and tries to find out what is a person's own thought or his own doing or his own originality, and what is it that is repetitious and is repeated by many people from one generation to another.

It's quite right that one, in ordinary life and in nature and as far as Mother Nature will allow on this Earth, that one takes what already has been done and makes it one's own. It is a requirement for a human being to do that. Animals don't do that. They start all over again in their own little next generation. Man builds. He has a facile--facility of understanding what has gone on and builds on that as scientific facts and continues in the development of that, if he can, with original thought. But he is not many times original enough, and he keeps on repeating or writing a little book or an encyclopedia and copying mistakes, without having any particular thought or knowledge even that it is a mistake because he does not, and gradually works less and less and copies more and more, and accepts certain things for their face value instead of having the essential quality. And this is such a terrible thing, that a man loses his originality of thought and he cannot--many times he cannot remain original because of his past. He is bound by that what he has learned and he cannot let it go because that what he has is his own, and he does not want to give it up because he is afraid. He doesn't want to lose it. And he has not built anything to take the place of that what was his

ordinary - and we call that unconscious - house in which he happens to live and which he carries with him. And he has no other edifice or house or a shed or any kind, I said sometimes, a palace that he has built for his life so that it could take the place of this what is now existent on the Earth. And his difficulty is that he does not know how to build it.

How often is a man bound in the expression of himself, not knowing sometimes where it comes from; and not daring to say what he really thinks, but always, out of consideration, having to do certain things because he has a fear that other people will criticize him and think that he is really not worthwhile because he is against the grain. How many people are bound by that what is love, so-called, for their father and mother; for that what has been taught and their teachers; for that what has been said and written in so-called holy script and which they don't understand but where they take the letter of the law and simply assume then that they know the content. And they really don't because they have no original desire for original thought and no desire to continue until they get away from the surface of their own life and become more and more essential. And that kind of a search is so difficult to continue with. All the obstacles of everyone around them; all the different ways of systematic knowledge; all that what is already established as an establishment - and to go against that and to become a rebel; or not to dare to say it because economically it is not wise, one might even lose one's job; or whatever it is that I want to do to grease the palm of those who have helped me to get where I am and, in gratitude, that I ought to think about them because they have placed me on a pedestal and I'm now supposed to remember them in my will - such things of course are terrible. But they belong to the Earth and no one can get free from his past. He has to learn how to place it and to give it a value that it deserves, not the value that at the time he attached

to it.

Each person has to learn to see what has been his past, to let it be in review passing by, for his life when he was young, when he experienced this and that, and trying to valuate it and gradually out of that he should distill value of truth for himself; that, you might say, what was his furniture in the old house on Earth, that he wants to see if it still has value to be placed in his new house - like many times when you move, you throw a lot of things away but you are very much attached to certain things: maybe sentimentality, maybe inherent value, maybe a certain suspicion that you never can tell how essential it is, maybe antiques, maybe esoteric, maybe essential essence which is unknown to a man but about which sometimes he has a feeling, a presentiment of that what he does not know. And sometimes, in looking over his youth and remembering it, he stands in awe for certain experiences that have taken place and seem to have had a different kind of coloration and a different kind of a value. This is how one learns; this is how one tries to free oneself; this is the terrible bondage that can stay with a man for a long time because it's so difficult to give up what has been precious, even if it has lost its character of preciousness - that what was form with content before and still is form and is now empty.

This is the terrible difficulty for a man, sometimes even to stand alone and to be by himself and only remembering how it was with the multitude, when everything was so good and kept one asleep. And then waking up to the fact that one is alone and, in that kind of lonesomeness, not knowing which direction to turn then only, sometimes I say, to any one of the four different directions of a man when he wishes to live on Earth, of which three are fairly well understood, scientific, artistic or philosophy - science and philosophy more and more belonging to an intellectual pursuit, art belonging to his heart. But that what needs a man and what is needed

by him and what needs a man to become alive is religion; and about religion it is so terrible because it's so mixed up and so completely written over and over, dogmatic and doctrine mixed, and reality and unreality made unclear by interpretations and not knowing anymore what is life than only that what has become a personified god.

When a man wants to find out what he is, he has to find it all out within himself. He can use all kind of other people: those who have striven to become, those who have lived before, those who have lived in their life and made attempts to understand the riddle of the universe. It doesn't matter if it's called the riddle of the world or that what is scientific study or that what is philosophy. And going to the depth of things, and deciding what is what and what is most important for a man; and how he - so-and-so - became well-known and wrote and again and again repeated himself; and where he got stuck because he belonged to a certain framework of the scientific world and it was not allowed for him to become rebellious; or he belonged to the church and he could not get out of the church, because it would have meant degradation and leaving the church. Who is willing to die?

I say these are conditions of the Earth. Maybe other forms of life somewhere else may not have such conditions, but for us it's a fata morgana. We don't know them. We live on Earth. We are with our feet planted here and we have to live here. We cannot get away but we have to learn to understand it. And so this is Work: to try to understand our bondage; to find out what we are within oneself and how we have become what we are and what we consider ourselves to be; and to learn the truth about ourselves without any questioning, without any rationalisation process, without having to have the interpretation of anyone else but ourselves; and to go by that what becomes clearer and clearer in that kind of a process of purification

of that what is a man when he looks at himself; and then considering that what he is and ultimately having to accept that what he is in reality - again I say, without any argument because there is nothing to argue about-- argue about a fact.

You see the meaning of that kind of Objectivity; we understand it. It is easy to understand, because what is objective for us? Artist? No. He cannot be objective; he is self-expressionist most of the time. Philosopher keeps on thinking and he does not come to Objectivity because many systems for him are of course feasible. He selects one for himself - even that he questions. He is not quite sure and, you might say, he never feels that he has studied enough because he has not facts by themselves. He lives by interpretation of concepts. A scientific man? He is a little bit more favorably placed. He collects facts. And what is exact science means that a scientist le--lives by objective facts and his definition of Objectivity is the acceptance of everybody in the scientific world to come to the same conclusion as he has come to as a result of his own experiments. That is what we call exact science.

When we use an inch or a meter or a centigram, or certain other weights not related to the body - like of course we have done that when we call it a foot or a thumb or that what is an elbow or an el, or that what belongs to his body as it is as we describe it. It is not certain enough because all bodies are different; all feet are different. But we can assume in a certain - let's say - a city that there is one foot which is acceptable as measure for everybody living in that city. And if you take a place like Holland, where there were several different cities in the olden days, where each had his own foot as measurement - and it was interesting because that was as far as they could go, but they wanted to have exact language for their city. And their dealings with other cities of that time didn't

happen so often. So afterwards, when one wanted to have more of a universal, so-called universal, a worldly measurement, of course we had to come to a meter and a centigram and whatever we use now as a measure of volume, and not inches, although we can use an inch when it is determined, defined as an inch of what or a yard. But do--what do we want in scientific facts?

I have an experiment and I want to publish it. It has reached certain results which are interesting because - let's say - I have been able to make a new substance with different properties. I first want to describe the substance as it is: what are the properties and how; what is its melting point; what is it, how it behaves; what are the characteristics of it; what is the reaction possibility - and all of that. Then I want to describe how I made it and I start out from certain raw materials and I put this together and A and B and certain conditions of pressure or volume or of temperature and then I boil it and I don't or I cool it off or whatever it is that I--that I do with it. After all, this is only material things; they have no life of themselves. But for science and chemistry and physics, I can determine then what was the method and write it up in a logical way of sequence, so that someone else reading it can repeat what has been my experiment and reach exactly the same substance and put it to the same tests and comes to the same conclusion. Then that is an absolute fact, an objective for that scientific world for all those who can repeat the experience and have the same level of intelligence.

So Objectivity means the acceptance by all those without exception in which their subjective interpretation has been eliminated. Now if that is the definition of Objectivity in relation to a man as he is on Earth with all his behavior, his forms of behaving, his way of thinking, his way of feeling, whatever he does - all of them, all manifestations being subjective, what is Objectivity? That what is understood by all people as freedom from subjectivity. And so each person has a perfectly good chance

to study his own subjectivity and write about it and compare it with the subjectivity of anyone else. And if then all of them together can agree on their subjectivity totally, they will agree on what is the concept of Objectivity. And so when a man starts to develop in an evolutionary sense and can gradually describe results of Objectivity for himself - in which that what he is has become a fact of existence without an interpretation which belongs to the Earth, without a wish of description which belongs to his subjective intellect, without any kind of a like or a dislike which belongs to his subjective solar plexus or his feeling - then he will reach an objective fact related to a man as he is and about which there is no further argument, because that man has one property which is an objective fact. Even if it takes on the form of a human being, it means that that what is the Objectivity is life in the man, and has nothing to do anymore with his form.

So you see the solution: to become free from the form in which life exists and to come to the conclusion that that what I wish to become aware of is my life as it now exists within. My form, when it is free, then I will know. This is the idea of Work. One says one fights for one's life. One starts to become more essential because there is less form in essence than on the surface. One penetrates as much as one can to free oneself more and more from ordinary subjectivity. One still is subject to the interpretation of one's essential life. One wants to reach one's inner life free from the interpretation of oneself, more and more becoming of that what one thinks God is like. And trying to describe then one's own essential life in the terminology of a higher form of being, one wishes to create for oneself an entity which has properties not of this world, but of Objectivity, and then allowing that what is objective, as a fact

existing away from this world, to enter into my life of subjectivity and tell me what is subjective and what is life; to tell me the difference between the form and that what it contains; to give me a chance to tell that what is reality, to be able to distinguish it from unreality - that what is me, within myself essentially as essence, as being God and life and reality - from that what I always have understood to be my ordinary subjectivity, as if this little 'I', as we call that, is aware of me and in the process of this me discovers--discovers my real 'I', as if that what is observing me enters through the form and reaches my essential essence, and in that process makes the form transparent. It does not mean non-existence - but not hampering me in my awareness to reach that what is the essentiality of my life.

Such things you see when you think, when you want to consider, when you want to remember, when you can see that kind of a task of becoming acquainted with yourself and to make this little 'I' function - and in the image of God because it is like God looking, that is, becoming aware of you, being there when you are there and you being there as much as you can in the presence which you believe is everywhere. Such concepts that one then can consider and with which one starts on this particular road of discovery of wishing to understand what is the bondage first and then to evolve as if one wants to leave it. And I say again: not prematurely, but leave it during the process of wishing to leave it; preparing for one's death by the manufacture or the creation of what I have called a little shed or a house to house again that what is one's life, even if the body gives way and is not there anymore to serve you.

The reason for the preparation is the understanding of the body becoming that what can be given up, that one doesn't need anymore. I can

live sometimes for a long time with having a servant and not doing everything myself. I say it is a question of my own royalty that I can employ someone to do my work, but when I realise that the servant sometimes may get sick or sometimes may not be there, or sometimes may not wish to serve me anymore - what will become of me? This we call Work, because in that kind of Work on myself I become prepared to live my life without a servant and to be able to continue with that what of course is much more important for me as my feeling and my emotions and that what I call my intellect, and to prepare both of them for the possibility of having to do without my body. And although the body at the present time is the house in which they live, I prepare a new house in Heaven where my emotions and where my intellect - but in purified form - can continue to exist. What prepares that? As the Bible says, Christ, which for us is in preparing mansions in Heaven; we, by means of Work, prepare for the future.

I hear that thing. Maybe I've said enough. Maybe we drink to the future, based on the understanding of the past - and not any longer than is necessary to be bound by it.

To Gurdjieff.

END TAPE

Transcribed: Enid Wolfe/J. O'Connell
1st Proof: Margaret Keck
2nd Proof: Naomi Friedman
3rd Proof: Pam Durr
4th Proof: Lenore Beach
Final Type: " "